

- 5 -

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECHES

OF

N. F. DAVIN, M.P.

ON

DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS

OTTAWA, 30TH MARCH AND 6TH APRIL, 1898

WEDNESDAY, 30th March, 1898.

Mr. DAVIN moved :

That good faith on the part of the present Government with the farmers of the North-west should compel them to place agricultural implements on the free list.

He said : This motion is one in which the farmers of the North-west Territories, and probably more than the farmers of the North-west Territories, take a deep interest. I wish to say, first of all, that I approach this motion in the character of a protectionist, and I see no reason whatever why the strongest protectionist in Canada should not vote for this motion. It is seconded by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I want also to say, in order to meet some of my independent friends on the other side and some of the Patrons ; this motion is not a vote of want of confidence in the Government. A vote of want of confidence in the Government is taken on a motion to go into committee, or when you traverse some other motion of the Government. But this motion is not a motion, technically and in the proper sense, implying a want of confidence, so that there is no reason why my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) or any other independent gentleman should not vote for it when we come to a vote, whether to-day or to-morrow,

the next day or next week. Because the time will come, as the Greeks said of death, to-morrow, the next day, or the day after. When we come to a vote I hope that we shall not see Ministers sliding up the gangway to interview the Patrons and the independent members. And if they do I hope they won't succeed, as they succeeded in 1896, and in 1897, and once again this very session. It is a humiliating spectacle. Once it was the Postmaster General who did this, another time it was the Minister of Agriculture, and lately it was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Why, Sir, I see the Postmaster General is at it again. Now, Sir, after the leader of the Opposition, I believe that I may say with truth that I have, at an earlier period than any other man in this House, advocated protection for the Dominion of Canada. I am a thorough believer in protection. Now, let me explain what scientific protection is. I understand that some manufacturers throughout the country, when they see in my name a motion like this, think that there is inconsistency on my part, or inconsistency on the part of hon. gentlemen who might vote for me. Why, Sir, this motion says in the first place that the Government, in order to keep good faith with the farmers of the North-west, should place agricultural implements on the free list. If I prove that the Government

promised the people of the North-west, held out language to the people of the North-west that sounded as a promise, that they would get implements on the free list, is there any man listening to me who is not bound to vote for that motion? Now, I want to explain what protection is. Protection does not mean that we are bound to put a duty on all articles that we manufacture in Canada. What protection means is this: That in regard to any industry that will flourish naturally in Canada, it is the duty of the Government to protect them from the foreigner until they get strong enough to fight unaided the world at large. The moment they get strong enough—protection does not say that you are going to put high duties on to keep outside competition away—to fight outside competition, then the protection may be withdrawn. In regard to this very article in this motion, what do we find? Why, Mr. Speaker, the truth about it is this: The Conservative party has done a great work for Canada and for these manufacturers. Before the Conservative party came into power in 1878, the implement manufacturers were in a sickly, in a poverty-stricken, in a helpless position. But after the Conservative party protected them, they not only made implements as good as were made in any other part of the world, they not only made them cheaper—which is one of the ends protection aims at—but they grew rich, and they grew able to fight the world in outside markets. My hon. friends on the opposite side of the House have again and again pointed out how these very manufacturers we are dealing with now, are able to send their goods to Australia, to the United States, to Great Britain, and to compete with all-comers in those markets, and we rejoice at it. I do not mention that in envious tones, or with a view of doing any harm to these manufacturers. On the contrary, I glory in it, because it is one of the results of a sound and wise policy on the part of the protectionist Government that was in power for so long, and with such great and happy results from this country. I take no stock in what the Prime Minister said on the 12th of October last in Montreal. It was like one of the extraordinary statements we get from him from time to time. He said that the Liberal party in 20 months had done more for the country than the Conservative party had done in 20 years. Well, that was like some of the boasts I met with in a very interesting book, "Tartarin de Tarascon." When I read the extraordinary gasconading statements of the leader of the Government as to the giants he has fought and killed, and the great game he has brought down, I am reminded of the incomparable Tarascon who went out to fight great game and to shoot lions and panthers, but he only succeeded at last in bringing down a don-

key. I take no stock in that kind of statement. I am here to-day as a protectionist and I move this motion and claim support for it on three grounds. First and foremost, is it to be tolerated for one minute that the farmers of the North-west should have held out to them by members who are now sitting on the Treasury benches, that if they got into power they would put those implements on the free list, and that then these hon. gentlemen can get into power, partly by the votes of those men, and when they cross over to the other side of the House, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce, now leading the House, crosses to the other side, when the leader of the Government crosses from this to the other side, when they taste the sweets of office, they can turn round and, to use a vulgar illustration but a very expressive one, make fat bacon at the whole North-west. Is it to be tolerated for a minute? Do you mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not bound as a North-west member to express the opinions of the farmers of the North-west, most all of whom are protectionists? But whether protectionists or not, they claim to have their disappointment, their indignation, their scorn, their contempt for men who behave in that way, expressed in this House, and expressed in strong language. Now, I ask again: What is protection? It is putting up a duty that will enable the native manufacturer to struggle on to strength, and wealth, and power, as these very implement manufacturers have progressed, and in doing that, not only give you good implements manufactured within the country, but keep the prices of those implements in the country, give employment to men, and supply a home market for the farmers. One of our mottoes in 1878, was that the workshop should be close to the farmer. I have here pamphlets that were circulated in 1878; I have the principles that were laid down then when we were asking to be returned to power. We wanted to protect the native manufacturer, not simply for the purposes of enriching him, but for the purpose of getting cheaper goods, goods manufactured in this country, increasing the home market, and thus adding to the wealth of the farmer, giving him not merely a market across the Atlantic and across the international boundary, but giving him a market at his own doors. Because my own language was that we wanted the factory near the farm, and our own tall chimneys darkening our own blue skies, the tall chimneys of the factories of Canada. What happened? The Conservative party were in power for eighteen years; and all you have to do is to look over the Trade and Navigation Returns, to look over the records of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, and to look over anything that gives a record of the progress of Canada for

those years
no count
try in h
Canada
der the b
party. V
servative
the most
profession
which I c
fluke tha
ing before
got into p
and amon
farmers o
plements
near me
eral conv
which M
said that
1859 there
vention in
It was
of the Hou
not lay do
programm
came ther
magnates
ada to con
of Canada
would be
the policy
Liberal pa
page 23 of
said:

I appear
what has al
that this co
cut-and-drie
day remains
itself. This
eral, a den
and my frie
leading the
policy to be
come from
represented.

Thus the p
tion were t
The conve
tions, and
will be fo
volume, is

That the
I ask the
words, bec
proposition
cal proposi

—should b
fective prin
the public s

That the
sound princ
Government,
to keep ther
opolies, trus

That to th
to the need
government.

N F D

those years to agree to this proposition, that no country on the face of the earth, no country in history ever progressed more than Canada did during those eighteen years under the beneficent policy of the Conservative party. We had a party opposing the Conservative party, denouncing their policy in the most unmeasured terms, throwing out professions in respect to other matters on which I do not wish to enter now, and by a fluke that party attained power, still holding before the people the idea that if they got into power they would do certain things, and among them that they would give the farmers of the North-west agricultural implements free of duty. I have in a volume near me the official report of the great Liberal convention that was held in 1893, of which Mr., now Sir Wilfrid Laurier, said that since the great Liberal meeting of 1859 there had never been such a grand convention in the history of Canada.

It was a very peculiar course the leader of the House took on that occasion. He did not lay down, as other leaders have done, a programme of his own. He said that he came there to learn; that he invited the magnates of the Liberal party all over Canada to come there and confer on the state of Canada, and enunciate a policy that would be not the policy of the leader, but the policy of the combined wisdom of the Liberal party. Hon. gentlemen will find at page 23 of the report the hon. gentleman said:

I appear before you now simply to confirm what has already been stated by Mr. Sutherland, that this convention is not a convention to ratify cut-and-dried resolutions, but that the work to-day remains with the members of the convention itself. This is in every sense of the word a Liberal, a democratic convention. I am anxious, and my friends who are associated with me in leading the Liberal party are anxious, that in the policy to be adopted, all the suggestions should come from the people themselves, who are here represented.

Thus the principle laid down at that convention were the principles of the Liberal party. The convention passed a series of resolutions, and one of these resolutions, which will be found recorded at page 71 of the volume, is as follows:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion—

I ask the attention of the House to these words, because I am going to prove my proposition as I would prove a mathematical proposition.

—should be based not, as now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been, by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations.

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

N F D-14

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

It was put forward before the whole country, and the whole country was called to witness, that if those hon. gentlemen got into power, they would eliminate, to use their own language, every shred of protection from this tariff. What was the utterance of Mr., now Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He said, and his remarks will be found at page 32:

Gentlemen, you have nothing to expect from them.

The hon. gentleman intended to say that the people had nothing to expect from the Conservatives, and that they had much to expect from the Liberals. The hon. gentleman was here referring to the promise made by Sir John Thompson in respect to mouldering branches. Again, the hon. gentleman said:

Apart from the logic of events, you have the word of Mr. Foster himself, who has declared again and again within the last few weeks that tariff reform would consist in this, that there might be a few changes here and there, but that the principle of protection in the National Policy would be maintained. This simply means that the Government are going to scratch off the paint and put on a new coat of varnish, and call it tariff reform.

The hon. gentleman here meant, of course, that he would not merely take off the varnish or put on a new coat of paint, but he would tear down the scaffold and erect a new structure from foundation to roof. He continued:

By virtue of what principle will you tax the farmer in order to give work to the workingman? On what principle will you tax the workingman in order to give better price to the farmer?

There is not, I may say, a single province throughout the Dominion which clamours so much and so loudly to be freed from the incubus of the National Policy as Manitoba. I submit to you that every cent that is levied should be levied first and foremost upon the luxuries of the people.

The Prime Minister came west. He spoke at Winnipeg, Moosomin, Regina, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, and I think at Edmonton—I forget whether he spoke at Medicine Hat or not—and at every one of those places he spoke in the same vein. The hon. gentleman had with him at one time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and at another time the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture in definite terms went into the very grievances arising from the duty

on agricultural implements. I will not read the speeches delivered on those different occasions, but I will make a quotation from a speech delivered by the present Minister of Agriculture at Moosomin, a report of which will be found in the Moosomin "Spectator," October 4, 1894. The hon. gentleman is of course concerned with any agricultural problems that require consideration at the hands of the Cabinet, and I quote from his speech. He said:

As a farmer he was not satisfied with the reduction which had been made in the agricultural implement duty.

"What reduction was that? It was a reduction made by the ex-Finance Minister from 20 per cent to 15 per cent." This reduction was made at one fell swoop, to use the sympathetic and eloquent language of the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and the Conservative Government recognizing that as a protectionist Government it had a duty to perform to the farmers to protect them as well as the manufacturers, and that the farmers of the west and the farmers all over the country occupy a special position. Although it is economically unsound, there is a strong colour of reason for what the farmers declare—although as I have said it is not scientifically correct—that agricultural implements are their raw material; and recognizing this, the hon. member for York, N.B., when Finance Minister in 1894, reduced the duty on agricultural implements by 15 per cent. In Room No. 16 the agent of the Massey-Harris Company stated at a time when iron had \$10 per ton duty on it as compared with \$7 per ton now, that if the duty on agricultural implements was reduced as low as 15 per cent and no lower, the Massey-Harris Company and other manufacturers could do well. But now, at one fell swoop, to use the sympathetic language of the hon. member for East Assiniboia, this reduction to which I have referred was made as low as 20 per cent. As a farmer, the Minister of Agriculture said:

Because the United States Congress had made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that offer. Last year the farmers of western Canada imported \$120,000 worth of American implements, on which they paid \$40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combination, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own market showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. If Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers?

As the Minister of Agriculture has just come in, I beg to inform him that I have been quoting from a speech delivered by him at Moosomin in October, 1894. The farmers flocked to hear and see these great Liberals, and what impression do you think,

Mr. Speaker, was made on the farmers who heard them? Sir, the impression was made that if the Liberals got into power the duty would be taken off these farming implements. But, Sir, the Liberals are not ready to take up their note offhand; they allowed their bills to be dishonoured in the bank of public opinion, and is it to be tolerated for a minute that the indignation of the disappointed farmers of Canada shall not get expression in this House?

Mr. BENNETT. Where are the North-west members to-day?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see many of them. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) are here, but the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is not here, and it is a pity, because I am going to quote some eloquent words from that hon. member. Now, a campaign sheet was issued by the Liberal party, and in that campaign sheet for the election of 1896 they held up as one of the enormities of the existing tariff the duty of 20 per cent which was imposed on farming implements, mowing machines, &c. But, Sir, the duty on these farm implements under a Liberal Government to-day is still 20 per cent. I want to call attention to the title page of this election pamphlet, because it is very instructive. It was what Plato would call an esoteric document. It was only intended for the perusal of the political elect and those to whom they would think fit to show it. This is the title:

Dominion of Canada, Principles, Policy and Platform of the Liberal Party.

And it says:

This pamphlet is not for general distribution.

(Signed) ALEX. SMITH,
Sec. of the Lib. Association.

And here is what this pamphlet set forth:

A reduction of the tariff as far as the interests of the revenue would permit, with a complete elimination of every feature of the tariff of a distinctive protective character.

And then we have the Conservative party held up to opprobrium because of the duty on farm implements was 20 per cent. Let me ask what impression was made on the farmers by such a pamphlet as that? Do the farmers of this country deserve consideration at the hands of the Government? You must remember that the farmer—I do not use this as the language of a demagogue—the farmer is the most useful man in the community. He begins everything; he lays the foundation of all our wealth; and he works under specially hard conditions frequently, because owing to the peculiarity of his business, if he has to borrow money he has to borrow it at a high rate of interest, and it is well known that the return for the farmer is very small compared with the return to the manufacturer

and the
hon. frie
Frost) h
in his b
am told
34 per c

Mr. D
wonder
when yo
Policy.

Mr. DA
and 1893
in this P
was in c
revision c

Mr. DA
time you

Mr. DA
that poor
pieces lon
knows w
North-we
a dog and
just as
(Mr. Dav
nut now
it was in
the tariff
attention
wan (Mr.
of my hon
ardson) to
hon. frien
to it; I
independe
of the so-
of patron
pendence
tion to th
not care
that comes
in the
the stran
by the
to criticize
a man fro
lower of
stands up
a certain
should be
ment pays
course, I
the abilit
katchewan
for the al
the west,
ties are o
Sir, there
members v
any twent
if they w
express th
western co

My hon.
Davis) said
this state
discover it
following.

and the business man. I do not see my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) here, but I am told that he is making in his business 34 per cent profit, and I am told that Massey-Harris & Co. make 34 per cent.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). It is a wonder you did not find that out long ago when you were supporting the National Policy.

Mr. DAVIN. I found it as early as 1892 and 1893, and in the latter year I moved in this House to lower the duties, and it was in consequence of my action that the revision of the tariff took place in 1894.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). That is the time you voted against your own motion.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it was not. I thought that poor joke of yours was knocked to pieces long ago. My hon. friend (Mr. Davis) knows what happens when out in the North-west a stone is flung by any one at a dog and the dog follows it meaninglessly; just as meaninglessly as my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) tries to bite at an old chestnut now. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was in consequence of my action that the tariff was revised in 1894. I call the attention of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) to this; I call the attention of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to it; I call the attention of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) to it; I call the attention of any of the independent members. I call the attention of the so-called Patrons, if there is a shred of patronism, if there is a shred of independence left in them; I call their attention to the fact that a Government does not care very much about the opposition that comes to it from the straight Opposition in the House, because the attack of the straight Opposition is discounted by the fact that it is its business to criticise and oppose. But the moment a man from behind the Government, a follower of the Government; the moment he stands up and expresses his opinion that a certain course contrary to their policy should be taken, that moment the Government pays attention to it. Although, of course, I have a very great respect for the abilities of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and a great respect for the abilities of my hon. friends from the west, still I do not say that their abilities are overpowering and gigantic. But Sir, there is not one of these western Liberal members who cannot accomplish more than any twenty men on this side of the House if they will only stand up and fearlessly express the opinions of the people in that western country whence they come.

My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) said to me, why did I not discover this state of things? Well, Sir, if I did not discover it, his friends, whom he is now following, discovered it. In the very pam-

phlet to which I have referred they set out a comparison between the farmer and the manufacturer to which I will call the attention as very interesting and instructive. This is the pamphlet on which the fight was fought in the province of Ontario and all over the country; it is the programme of the Liberal party, and, under the heading of "Manufacturers' Profits and Farmers' Profits," it says:

The question is sometimes asked, why are farm lands decreasing in value? They are decreasing for the same reason that other stocks decrease—because the profit, after the expense of working them is paid, is so small.

Then it points out that according to the census of 1891 the manufacturers' profit was 34 per cent on a capital invested of \$353,000,000; while the farmers' investment for the year 1892, according to the Ontario Bureau of Industries, was \$979,000,000, and the net proceeds amounted to only \$114,000,000. So that according to the case made out by the campaign sheet of the Liberal party the farmer deserves special consideration at our hands. But what does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, as a rule, leads this House, say on this subject? He said it here in 1894, when we were about to legislate:

The produce of the farmer has been driven to the lowest point, but what he has to buy is sold to him at an increased price, as compared with the price in England. The farmer is bound by his circumstances to sell in the freest and cheapest market; so also ought he to be privileged to buy in the cheapest market, consistent only with the imposition of such duties as are necessary for raising the revenue of the country. That is a proposition perfectly fair, perfectly just, perfectly equitable—so fair, so just, so reasonable and so equitable that the Government dare not attack it openly. And yet they cannot adopt it. Why? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just and fair and equitable.

These are the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and they apply to the present Government. That is the system they are carrying out now. In the Railway Committee yesterday the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) declared that if the present tariff was not high enough, he would be in favour of a tariff—and he would introduce a Railway Act to enable him to bring it in to force by Order in Council—that would fully protect the people in the Boundary Creek country. The Minister of Railways says that, but mark the language of his leader:

And yet they cannot adopt it. Why? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just and fair and equitable.

That language went to the west in 1894. What were the farmers to think? When the right hon. gentleman went west himself, the "Globe" had a picture of him bending over the North-west farmer, whose hands were manacled and gyved by the very tariff which is in force to-day; and there we had

the right hon. gentleman depicted as knocking off the chains and fetters of the poor North-western farmer. We had another picture—a picture of the man who fell among thieves, also the North-west farmer; and there was the Good Samaritan, Wilfrid Laurier, bending over him and pouring the oil of joy and gladness into his wounds. But what the poor man who fell among thieves got from the right hon. gentleman was bottles of wind, vials of sunny ways of vapidity; his promise to the North-west having proved of no more value than a dicer's oath. I want to show you, Sir, the disappointment that was felt. I have here the opinion of Duncan Marshall, who gives the views of the Patrons of Ontario, when they saw this tariff: "It is disappointing to the farmers who had been promised substantial changes from the party now in power," says Duncan Marshall, the well-known Patron campaigner. Hon. gentlemen can find this in the "Sun" newspaper of the 29th of April, 1897. He goes on to mention a number of articles which the farmer is interested in, on some of which the duty is higher to-day than it was under the Conservative Government. Now, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) when he made his maiden speech in this House, referred to the promises that had been made by the Liberal party. I have here the words of his speech, which will be found in "Hansard" in the debate on the Address. He, relying on such promises, did not think it necessary to support my contention in regard to implements, because he said:

If it is the intention of the Government to place agricultural implements on the free list and to meet the desire of the farmers of the North-west Territories, and carry out the promises made by the Liberal candidates, and by the supporters of the Liberal candidates in the North-west Territories, why delay it? Can any reason be given for delaying?

And I remember that my hon. friend was not able to vote with me, because he had confidence that when Parliament met in 1897 the Government would give the relief to the farmer that he said they had promised; and I can conceive that my hon. friend, with the independence that has already done him honour and placed him on a pinnacle before the people of this country for what he has done this year, is bound to support me on the present occasion. But to show how disappointed the people of the North-west were, I have here what took place in Winnipeg in October, 1897, when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) were present. This is what the hon. member for Winnipeg said:

He dealt with the tariff first, and said that western members were disappointed with it.

Why were they disappointed with it? Because in that very city of Winnipeg the Prime Minister had promised, with regard

to these very agricultural implements, that the farmers of the North-west would get them on very different terms from those on which they were getting them under the Conservative tariff.

He dealt with the tariff first, and said that western members were disappointed with it, but he was sorry to say that in their effort to reduce it, the western men had a force against them which was not all party, and mentioned as instances, Mr. Frost, the implement man.

That is the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville.

—demanding reduced rates on everything but his products, and the duties on them he would like increased.

Probably that hon. gentleman had some secret promise, because in the contest at West Toronto one of the opponents of the present members declared that the duty of 20 per cent was not enough for Mr. Frost and Massey & Harris, and that the Government would raise it. This is what the hon. member for Winnipeg went on to say:

Mr. Frost, the implement man, demanding reduced duties on everything but his products, and the duties on them he would like to see increased; also, Mr. Fraser, M.P. for Lambton, who is interested in the oil-producing works, wanted the duties kept up on oil, and several other Liberals were likewise in their theoretical love of free trade, but did not want the duties on their own particular goods touched. As a matter of fact, the whole of the east is against the west in the matter of protection.

Then the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) spoke. There is a picture of that hon. gentleman published in this newspaper report, and as I regard my hon. friend as a handsome man, I think he ought to sue for libel the artist who drew this picture of him, but probably the artist accurately depicted the expression of sadness and gloom which then changed the hon. gentleman's appearance, arising from the disappointment he had experienced in Ottawa. Here is what my hon. friend from Lisgar said:

Mr. Richardson spoke of the disappointment the tariff was to him, and said it was hard to get the duty on farmers' implements left alone, as the tendency in the caucus meetings was to increase them rather than decrease.

But who does not remember how that duty was denounced in the Liberal campaign sheets and speeches in 1895 and 1896. If my hon. friend had supported me the last time I brought this matter up, that would not have been the tendency in the caucus, and if he will support me now, he will do a great deal to destroy that tendency in the caucus of his party. He will find that if he is true to himself and speaks out his mind, not merely in meetings when he goes home, but here, which is the place above all where a member of Parliament ought to speak—because, although there is appropriateness in a member of Parliament speaking to his constituents on the platform in his riding

and thro
where he
that is in
—he will
the peop
something
accompli
ing hard
was a ser
something
I believe
they are
that in
grasp of
know ver
what a
on a you
rounding
I see tha
notizing
friends.
of the C
society.
fluence is
that one
lower his
so benum
isters, wh
full of fir
for Saska
hon. frien
las). Wh
partly by
profession
ciety, and
thing is n
I underst
Crown w
considerat
or come w
have, so
Ottawa, t
and have
leaders, b
chorus, an
minuet.
This is
is reported

The gre
against a
sulted. Th
brought de
rule had e
or to go i
tended to d

Well, I
hon. frien
leader. H
has said.
ing at the
Tarte Cl
presented
picture ap
medal, w
it, hangi
medal an
consistent
friend's le

and through the press, there is no place where he is so bound to speak out the truth that is in him as in this House of Commons—he will raise himself in the estimation of the people of the west, and he will effect something. That is the way I succeeded in accomplishing what I did. It was by kicking hard from year to year, and there never was a session in which I did not accomplish something for the farmers of the North-west. I believe my hon. friends mean well, but they are young members, and I do not think that in their first session they had a full grasp of their duties as parliamentarians. I know very well, because I have observed it, what a benumbing and hypnotic influence on a young member is produced by his surrounding at Ottawa, when he first arrives. I see that the "Globe" talks of the hypnotizing influence of society on its own friends. It tells us that even the Ministers of the Crown are hypnotized by Ottawa society. It says that the great social influence is Conservative, and its effect is such that one Minister after another has had to lower his flag before it. If that influence is so benumbing and hypnotizing on the Ministers, what must it not be on a wild bronco, full of fire, like my hon. friend the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). Or take my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). Why, my hon. friend was, of course, partly by circumstances and partly by his profession, kept away all his life from society, and we know very well that, when a thing is novel, its impression is far greater. I understand that even Ministers of the Crown who, when west, would not for any consideration have entered a dancing room, or come within the sound of a dancing fiddle, have, some of them, since arriving in Ottawa, taken lessons of a dancing master, and have become, not merely political leaders, but leaders in the terpsichorean chorus, and gracefully bow and salute in the minuet.

This is what my hon. friend from Lisgar is reported in his own paper as having said:

The great difficulty members had to contend against at Ottawa was that they were not consulted. The Government made up its mind, and brought down its measures, and members as a rule had either to swallow the entire programme or to go into opposition. This policy very often tended to compromise the position of members.

Well, I have consolation in store for my hon. friend. He misunderstands his own leader. He has not read all that his leader has said. On the 12th of October last, speaking at the glorification of Mr. Tarte at the Tarte Club, at the same time that he was presented with the Tarte medal, of which a picture appeared in "La Patrie"—the Tarte medal, with the picture of Israel Tarte on it, hanging side by side with the Cobden medal and the star which emblazoned his consistent and proud bosom—my hon. friend's leader said—and I cite this to show

my hon. friend that he need not swallow all the programme of the Government:

The Liberal party does not require of its members a blind support of any measure which seems good to its leaders.

So that I bring my hon. friend some consolation. He will be able now to go back to his constituents and tell them that one of those obscurantist Tories, on the other side of the House, who comes from the west, called his attention to certain words of his right hon. leader which are an emblazonment of liberty for the Liberals behind him. My hon. friend will not, therefore, feel bound to swallow the whole programme of the Government; he will not feel bound to swallow the whole elephant, and do mortal injury to his political digestion; he will not be forced to say, with Hosea Bigelow:

A merciful Providence fashioned us holler
O' purpose that we might our principles swaller.

I have something further.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a question of privilege. I wish to state to the House that the hon. gentleman has distinctly and entirely quoted my remarks in "Hansard."

Mr. DAWSON. I will send for the "Hansard" of the second session of 1896, and hope to be able to show the hon. gentleman that I have not misquoted him, but that I have given him full credit for what he said. If I have done otherwise, I shall make the "amende honorable" for I have, for convenience, taken a newspaper report professing to be verbatim.

I want to call the attention of my hon. friend who is now leading the House (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and I am glad to see him leading it because he leads it with grace and dignity—I want to call his attention to what he said in 1895:

This is not a case for half measures. You have in the fate of the Democratic party of the United States a warning and an example of the doom which will overtake any party that palters with its convictions, and after having placed itself at the head of a great popular movement, will offer the people a stone instead of bread.

That is the language which he used, when speaking of the Liberal policy with regard to the tariff.

These are weighty words, and they seem to be prophetic as well as weighty, for already the indignation of this people of Canada, this outraged and betrayed people is rising against a Government that does not regard its promises, its programme or its professions. What I said in 1896 could be said with still more truth now, the pallor of death is glooming upon the face of that moribund Ministry.

I was walking in the city of Hull the other day. I found that they were changing the name of the streets there, and, in this re-baptising of streets, they call one Avenue Laurier. I thought I would

have the glory and pride of walking down this new-named street. While passing along it I began to think how, when the late Emperor Napoleon came into power, they changed the names of the streets in Paris, substituting for names that rang with republicanism those that reminded passers-by of Napoleon and Louis Napoleon. And I remember when I went through those streets of Paris in the autumn of 1870, the names redolent of the coup d'Etat were being torn down and names substituted that rang of the déchéance. I went along this street in Hull called the Avenue Laurier, and do you know whither it led? I hope it will not be injurious to your health, Mr. Speaker, or to the health of the Liberals. It led—'absit omen'—to a graveyard.

WEDNESDAY, 6th April, 1898.

Mr. DAVIN continuing his speech on the motion: That good faith on the part of the present Government with the farmers of the North-west should compel them to place agricultural implements on the free list, said: Mr. Speaker, six o'clock came the other day before I was able to conclude my speech introducing the motion on the paper, and I have a few remarks to make to which I would ask the attention of hon. members on both sides of the House. What I did up to six o'clock was this. I proved that in the Liberal Convention of 1893 a reduction of the tariff was promised on the lines of providing merely for the revenue and of giving the North-west farmers and the farmers generally exceptional advantages, in case the Liberal party came into power. I then proved that the leader of the Government went west, accompanied by some of his colleagues, and that at Winnipeg, at Moosomin, at Regina, at Moose Jaw, Edmonton and Prince Albert promises were made on the same lines, only more definite; and I quoted a passage from a speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture which amounted to a definite promise that if the Liberals came into power agricultural implements would be placed on the free list. Those words are in "Hansard." I quoted also from the campaign sheet of 1895-96, which I have here bound with other precious documents issued by the Liberal party, where they expressed an opinion adverse to the present tariff on agricultural implements. I also showed from the "Farmer's Sun" that the farmers throughout Canada were disappointed. I showed by quotations that the hon. member for Winnipeg and the hon. member for Lisgar stated openly and in public in Winnipeg, that they were disappointed; and now I shall proceed to quote statements made by my hon. colleague the member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to show that he was also disappointed. In fact, he told the Government—what? It is a most extraor-

inary thing that with the tones of the Finance Minister's speech last night in his ears, knowing that nothing has been done for the farmers or for the farmers of the North-west, the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia sits complacently in his seat, happy and smiling. On that occasion to which I refer, however, he told the leader of the Government that his policy had not left his supporters in the west a leg to stand on. Lest that mere description should be considered too vague, I will quote the language of my hon. friend, and I ask the attention of the Finance Minister to this statement, because some personal references are made by the member for Eastern Assiniboia to that hon. gentleman. This is what the hon. member (Mr. Douglas) said at Wapella:

The tariff had, in a word, been a disappointment. The change was made on the basis of a 10 per cent reduction. We didn't get the changes we wanted. He (Mr. Douglas) had done most of his talking on the subject, not on the floor of the House, but in committee.

What committee? If it was in committee, it was in Committee of the Whole, and was in public. But I think he refers to some secret conclave they had. I may tell the hon. member that it is not a parliamentary proceeding to conduct business that should be conducted on the floor of the House in camera and in secret with the Ministers.

The Government must have a revenue, and he did not want any Administration to do that for the farmers which we condemn them doing for the manufacturers. He claimed that he made no promise of free implements, &c. What he wanted was justice.

So, when the hon. gentleman attends an open conference with his party he does so on a good Conservative's advice. That shows the modesty that may be in a bosom like that of my hon. friend. A Latin writer penned that well-known and hackneyed line, which may be familiar to the hon. gentleman:

Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?
Dwells such dire anger in celestial minds?

How can such complacency as the following fill the bosom of a divine?

He had made the strongest speech he had made in the House on the excessive rates on implements, &c. He had told the Government he would rather kick them in their own shanty than outside. When Messrs. Fielding and Paterson met with these manufacturers they (the manufacturers) said, "You are making a general reduction of 25 per cent? If that is so, we ask you for an advance on the implement duty to put us on a fair basis," and to compromise the matter they had allowed them free raw material, and the machine men had promised to make a \$5 reduction in the prices of machines.

Do you see, Mr. Speaker, what is admitted? The hon. gentleman has no confidence in the Ministers, who, instead of giving a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements,

have given

facturers.
As soon as
Sir Wilfrid
It was gran
come to ta
coal oil.
"Sir, I war
the membe
stand on, b
people, and
meet them

In the to
tlemen spo
this langu

The farm
but justice.
sent tariff,
get speech
satisfied wit
be done und
was the Go
old tariff w
This was a
was, upon
Patrons of

Now, twel
never saw
complacenc
Minister, w
perfect del
I thought
thing. No
made, that
made to c
hon. gentle
cause any
the interes
poor man.

As soon a
Premier ask

He repeat

This was
they had no
a single an
people. Ag
eral reducti
marked imp
argument b
that they h
from 35 to 2

But who
20? Not t
Minister of
Government

He had be

Now, thi
interesting

After thin
he (Mr. Doug
specting the
from the U
from time
Mr. Fielding
could be he
humoured v
you next Au
plied, "You
hours," whe
you in twen

have given increased protection to the manufacturers.

As soon as he saw the new tariff he wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and asked for an interview. It was granted, and he told the Premier he had come to talk on agricultural implements and coal oil. He had said to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, "Sir, I want to tell you this, you haven't given the members from the North-west a leg to stand on, because this is a large question to our people, and we have not now an argument to meet them with.

In the town of Grenfell the hon. gentleman spoke on the same subject, and used this language:

The farmers did not ask for special favours, but justice. He was not satisfied with the present tariff, and according to Mr. Fielding's budget speech the Government themselves were not satisfied with it. But it was the best that could be done under the circumstances. At least, that was the Government's explanation of it. The old tariff was placed upon a rate of 35 per cent. This was a considerable reduction, but the Bill was, upon the whole, a disappointment to the Patrons of Industry.

Now, twelve months have elapsed, and I never saw a man in my life who evidenced complacency more than the hon. Finance Minister, who in his speech last night showed perfect delight in the present tariff, in fact, I thought he was well satisfied with everything. No changes in the tariff have been made, that is to say, no changes have been made to carry out the promises made by hon. gentlemen during eighteen years, because any changes in the tariff are against the interests of the farmers and against the poor man.

As soon as he saw it he wrote a note to the Premier asking an interview in reference to it.

He repeats this important interview.

This was granted, and he told Mr. Laurier that they had not left their supporters in the west a single argument with which to meet the people. Against this it was held that the general reduction of about ten per cent was a marked improvement, and it was shown as an argument by the manufacturers of machinery that they had been reduced at one fell swoop from 35 to 20 per cent.

But who reduced it from 35 per cent to 20? Not this Government, not the present Minister of Finance; but the Conservative Government and Mr. Foster.

He had been put off from time to time.

Now, this is what I thought would be interesting to the Minister of Finance:

After thinking a good deal over the situation he (Mr. Douglas) decided to ask for a hearing respecting the valuation of implements imported from the United States. He had been put off from time to time, but finally having caught Mr. Fielding in the lobby he asked him when he could be heard. Mr. Fielding said, in a good-humoured way, "O, Mr. Douglas, I will hear you next August." To this he (Mr. Douglas) replied, "You shall hear me within twenty-four hours," when Mr. Fielding replied, "I will hear you in twenty minutes."

But he did not succeed in getting the duty reduced. Sir, we have in Grenfell, N.W.T., a man of great ability; a man well known to my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas); a man who is a farmer himself; a man who has founded, I believe, most of the Patron lodges in western Assinibola, Mr. Charles Nichol. This is the way Mr. Charles Nichol comments on what was done:

Speaking of the duty on agricultural implements, which was one of the points of the old tariff most strongly and persistently attacked by the Liberals—

I ask the attention of the House to this:

—and by Mr. Douglas himself, we believe, previous to the general elections, he said the Massey-Harris Company demanded that the duty be raised from 20 to 25 per cent, and that they had reason and logic on their side, and that in asking that implements be placed on the free list the farmer was trying to shift at least a fair share of the public burdens to other shoulders.

In the course of an article characterized by principles of sound political economy, Mr. Nichol refutes this paltry argument of the hon. member for East Assinibola (Mr. Douglas), and he thus concludes:

We are told that the Massey-Harris Company have a greater sale for their implements in other countries, such as Great Britain, Australia, &c., than any of their competitors. Assuming that to be correct, and that they do not sell in those markets without a fair profit, on what grounds of "reason and logic," as Mr. Douglas puts it, can a 20 or 25 per cent duty be defended here? We venture to say neither Mr. Douglas or the Government saw reason or logic in it previous to the last general election. And we venture still further to say that the shallow fallacies of either Mr. Douglas or the Government, or other interested parties, will not impose upon the intelligent electors in the North-west for the time to come.

That, Sir, was written by a man who before he was a Patron was a strong, vigorous Reformer, and if he is anything but a Patron to-day, he is yet a strong, vigorous Reformer. That is the way this gentleman writes in a western town, taking the language of the hon. member for East Assinibola (Mr. Douglas); taking the language of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), and Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), when brought before their constituents in which they say they were disappointed in the tariff. I say, Sir, that I have established beyond cavil that good faith on the part of the present Government would necessitate their taking the steps that I mention in that motion.

Now I am going to show that even the imps and familiars of the Government thought they would take another course. And what must have been the horror in the bosom of one of these who, looking down at the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) last night, heard him when he told us that the debt had been increased which they promised to reduce, and that the expenditure had gone up which they promised to reduce;

yes, Sir, by millions. Last night the Minister of Finance told us that both the national debt and our annual expenditure had increased, and he was cheered by his supporters for it. He showed us the country was prospering, by giving us what we could have had from the Trade and Navigation Returns, but he did not explain to us why the debt had increased.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I won't be out of order; I will retire at once; I see my hon. friend has got a little paler and I will not be the cause of making another Minister sick. Two of them are ill now, and I certainly do not want to make a third ill. I am glad to know at any rate that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will soon be convalescent, and in fact I have heard—although I have always understood that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was a man of great abstemiousness—I have heard that what he is suffering from is partaking too much of pastry; he has had too much Tarte.

Now, Sir, a pamphlet was published by a gentleman who sits in that Press Gallery and has sat in it for many years. He is a gentleman named Magurn, and he published a pamphlet on the tariff revision in the spring of 1897, to which pamphlet he attached his name; it was criticized in the "Citizen," and this is what Mr. Magurn says in the pamphlet:

What is to be the tariff of the new Liberal Administration to be laid before Parliament and the country in a few weeks? To go over the tariff item by item, as Mr. Foster did in the revision of 1894, is only necessary in the maintenance of a protective system, and would be a task of great magnitude, as it proved to be at the time. In the present case the tariff commissioners consist of men who believe in the principle that the prime duty of a tariff is to raise a revenue, and that being the main object, the work of revision is simple compared with the other. To classify the imports and deal with them on some general principle is the only thing to be done. A low duty must be placed on the necessities of life.

Hear that; hear that, ye farmers throughout the North-west and Manitoba, and now sugar is being taxed still higher. Is sugar a necessary of life or not?

Specific duties must be set aside—

And there are 135 specific duties in the present tariff:

Specific duties must be set aside in order to relieve the tariff from the scandal of making the cheapest goods pay the highest tax. Raw materials must be subjected to a low rate of duty in order that legitimate manufacturing shall not be heavily handicapped.

That is written by a devoted henchman of the present Minister of the Interior, and when he was coming back from the Klondike with the Minister of the Interior, he was en-

abled to put up a deal in Winnipeg by which he became correspondent of the Winnipeg "Free Press." He was already correspondent of the "Witness," and I do not know how many other papers and, Sir, I am sorry to say that on his taurine adolescence I act like a red rag on a bull. The moment he has to write about me he loses himself completely—I know he cannot help it, he is not responsible for it—but the moment he has to write about me he lies like a misplaced milestone which under no circumstances can tell the truth. So, Sir, I tell my friends in the North-west who read the "Witness," and I tell my friends in the North-west who read the Manitoba "Free Press," that when they read anything about me in either of these papers—if they read the leading articles, that is different; the leading articles are written with great ability and with fairness—but whenever that correspondent mentions me in any paper, let them remember the misplaced milestone, and remember, too, that there is an equation that I defy Sir Isaac Newton, if he were to rise from his grave, to find a flaw in; it is: Magurn and misplaced milestone; misplaced milestone and Magurn.

Now, Sir, I think I have demonstrated the proposition. Is there to be any relief? Clearly, none. I must not refer, it seems, to the Finance Minister's speech; but I may say that nothing that has occurred in this House this session can hold out any hope to the people of this country that the promises made will be fulfilled. I see, by the way, that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), as usual, is not in his place. He is never in his place, whether it is late at night or early in the day. This is too early for any terpsichorean exertions, for which I would excuse him at nine o'clock in the evening. But with regard to the young Napoleon, I would say:

Oh, blame not Napoleon if in pleasure's soft dream

He should try to forget what he never can heal.

because I am quite certain that he would feel a strong desire to do better things, only the social duties call him to those terpsichorean exercises.

Oh, give but a hope, let a vista but gleam

Through the gloom of the Klondike, and mark how he'll feel;

Every passion, it nursed, all the hopes it adored,

That incant' his heart at Yukon will lay down,

And he'll smile as he can at Mackenzie & Mann,

And deal out dredging claims to his friends standing round.

That is a parody sent to me by a young friend from Montreal. The hon. Minister of the Interior when at Vancouver, put the stroke of finality on the tariff of last session. He said—and he said the same thing at Regina—and I call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to it:

Sir Richard Cartwright is a pretty good free trader, and Sir Richard Cartwright is satisfied with the tariff.

Thus w
Minister
whether t
that the
is satisfie
have dem
posite on
they wou
agricultur
They hav
good faith
we for on
tacle we a
benches,
upon defi
they have
attempted
betrayed
promises;
promises.
stalwart
(Mr. Mul
House, at
least tax
are his sy
to his bo
there is
merce, wh
necessarie
now takin
tolerated
of the Ne
to my du
motion of
faith shou
agricultur
But befo
thing—

Some ho

Mr. DA
else—hon.
the senten
the last t
from Albe
evidently
wrong, th
unwitting
the "Han
a quotatio
that had
"News,"
does not c
in a new
I am very
my atten
he said s
was in t
hon. frien

I will say
west—at le
present—an
disappointe
not doing
unreasonab
second plac
not expect
notice. H
tariff, and

Thus we have on the authority of the Minister of the Interior—I do not know whether it is a very good authority or not—that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is satisfied with this tariff. Now, Sir, I have demonstrated that hon. gentlemen opposite on several occasions promised that they would, if they got into power, place agricultural implements on the free list. They have got into power, and I say that good faith should compel them to do it. Are we for one minute, Sir, to tolerate the spectacle we are confronted with on these front benches, of men who have got into power upon definite promises, and who, although they have had three sessions, have not yet attempted to redeem a promise? They have betrayed the people to whom they made the promises; they have gone back on their promises. How well I remember how the stalwart form of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) used to rise on this side of the House, and how he would denounce the least tax on the necessities of life. Where are his sympathies now? They have gone to his boots, as the "Sun" said. Then there is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who also denounced all taxes on the necessities of life, and we know what is now taking place. It is a thing not to be tolerated for a moment; and the farmers of the North-west would hold me as false to my duty to them if I did not put this motion on the paper, declaring that good faith should compel the Government to place agricultural implements on the free list.

But before I sit down I have to say something—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

MR. DAVIN. I have to say something else—hon. gentlemen should let me finish the sentence. In the course of my remarks the last time, I referred to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). My hon. friend evidently thought that I had done him some wrong, though certainly if I did, I did it unwittingly, and my hon. friend sent me the "Hansard." What I did was to take a quotation from my hon. friend's speech that had appeared in the Medicine Hat "News," and I am free to confess that it does not quite accord, as sometimes happens in a newspaper, with what was said; but I am very glad that my hon. friend called my attention to it, because I think what he said suits me almost better than what was in the Medicine Hat "News." My hon. friend said:

I will say further, that the people of the North-west—at least that section of them I claim to represent—are sensible people, and they are not disappointed at the leader of this Government not doing what, in the first place, it would be unreasonable to expect of him, and what, in the second place, would be an impossibility. They do not expect a revision of the tariff at a moment's notice. But they do expect a revision of the tariff, and they expect a thorough revision.

That expectation is still unfulfilled:

They expect a revision of the tariff that will be in their interest, and I have every confidence they will get that revision from the present Government, and they will get it in good time.

My hon. friend is an instance of misplaced confidence, because he has not got it yet.

I wish further to point this out, Sir: the agricultural season in that country is very nearly over, the purchase of farm machinery for the season has been made, and the reduction of the duty which will take effect during the coming winter will be just as beneficial to the people of the North-west as if it were made now.

Showing what my hon. friend expected, and it has not taken place yet, because implements are still at 20 per cent, as they were at that time. Why, Sir, the snows of 1896-97 are gone, and the snows of 1897-98 are pretty well gone, and still what my hon. friend expected has not taken place.

Now, Sir, the same person to whom I have already referred commented on a reference I made to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government. That reference, it seems, struck my friend as not in good taste because the right hon. leader of the House is poorly. I wish to read what I did say, because, of course, the papers only gave the briefest summary of my remarks. I could not expect them to do otherwise, because they have only a certain amount of space, and I might well be content with the space I got in most of them. They reported me as saying:

Now the people were rising against the Government which did not keep its promises, and the colour of death was upon it. He had noticed that the people of Hull named a street of their city Laurier Avenue, but following it up he found the avenue led to a graveyard.

What do you think the same writer led the people of Winnipeg and Manitoba to understand from that? That I was speaking of the health of the Prime Minister. I, therefore, feel bound to read what I did say, and it will be seen that I was not thinking of the health of the right hon. gentleman at all, but of the health of the Government. This is what I said:

I want to call the attention of my hon. friend who is now leading the House (Sir Richard Cartwright)—and I am glad to see him leading it, because he leads it with grace and dignity—I want to call his attention to what he said in 1895:

"This is not a case for half measures. You have in the fate of the Democratic party of the United States a warning and an example of the doom which will overtake any party that falters with its convictions, and after having placed itself at the head of a great popular movement, will offer the people a stone instead of bread."

That was what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said would be the fate of a party that did not keep its promises, and it was because of hints thrown out here and there, which came to his ears and, no doubt,

shocked his sense of principle and convictions as a free trader, that he held out this warning flag to his party. Commenting on this prophetic warning, I went on to say :

That is the language which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce used when speaking of the Liberal policy with regard to the tariff.

Now Sir, these are weighty words, and they seem to be prophetic as well as weighty, for already the indignation of this people of Canada this outraged and betrayed people, is rising against a Government that does not regard its promises, its programmes or its professions. And, Sir, what I said in 1896 could be said with still more truth now, the pallor of death is already upon the face of that moribund Ministry.

It is quite clear that I was speaking of the Ministry, and not at all of the right hon. gentleman who is leading it. Then I went on to make a perfectly clear and legitimate use of a circumstance, because, as Virgil says, there are tears in things, and another Latin poet says there is a prophetic element in the commonest events. I went on to say:

I was walking in the city of Hull the other day. I found that they were changing the names of the streets there, and that in this rebaptizing of streets they called one avenue Laurier. I thought I would have the glory and pride of walking down this new-named street. While passing along it I began to think how, when the late Emperor Napoleon came into power, they changed the names of the streets in Paris, substituting names that rang with republicanism to those that reminded passers-by of Napoleon and Louis Napoleon. And I remember when I went through those streets of Paris afterwards, the names significant of Napoleonism had been torn down, and the names substituted that were significant of its debasement. I went along this street in Hull, called the Avenue Laurier, and do you know whither it led? I hope it will not be injurious to your health Mr. Speaker, or to the health of the Liberals. It led—"absit omen"—to a graveyard.

Is it not palpable, that the whole thing was a reference to the Government, and not to the leader of the Government, and that use was made of the circumstance to shadow forth the decay and destruction of that Government, of which my right hon. friend is the head. But what has been the result of the short report that appeared in the newspapers in Toronto? A letter has come to me from a prominent man there, saying that he was very much impressed by what appeared in the papers, but still more by something that he, too, had noticed; for but a few days before he had been up in that quarter of Toronto where St. James Cemetery is, and he sent me a map of that part, which I now hold in my hands. Here you have Parliament Street in one place, Wellsley Street in another, Amelia Street and Sackville Street, and there is St. James Cemetery, and another street leading into it, which has been rebaptized Laurier Avenue. I need hardly say, that the coincidence is very peculiar.

Sir, there is not a man in the Liberal ranks who would feel more sorry than I, if there

was anything serious the matter with the right hon. leader of the House. Strong friends of mine have, again and again, taken me to task for what they call a custom of mine, of saying nice things about my right hon. friend. Well, if I ever said nice things about him, it was because I felt them. I am glad now to know that there is nothing serious the matter with him. We know, from the papers, that it is nothing serious, and, therefore, I am free to-day, as I was when originally speaking, to say, "absit omen." There is a prophecy in things, as well as tears, and that prophecy seems to point to the destruction of that Government which has been false to all its promises, and which is false to-day than we ever knew it to be before. The sun that rose this morning and looked down on our fair Dominion, knew that we have, in the present Government, a more perjured Administration than we ever knew it to be before—false to all its professions, false to all its programmes, and, with cynical disregard of its most cherished convictions, nailing its flag to the mast of protection and striking at the poor man in his deposits, in his newspaper, in the sugar that sweetens his tea. And then, we have the Finance Minister, just as if he were cross-fishing a stream, winking pleasantly at Mr. Bertram and saying: Tinkering of the tariff is a thing of the past; and then winking, with equal gusto, at the free traders behind and saying: Never mind what we say to Bertram and the manufacturers, eternal vigilance is required of them; that is what they will have to pay, if they are going to keep their place in the world; we must stick to free trade.

We now know what they will do. We know very well that they have completely gone back on all their professions; we know, from the language of one Minister after another, what they propose to do. We have had the leader of that Government declaring, with a curious cynicism that it pained me to see and that I did not think was possible in him: "I do not mind wearing the clothes of my opponents, provided they fit me." I thought that was a wanton boast on the part of my right hon. friend, seeing that, in his habits of dissimulation he has a vast wardrobe all his own.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think there is very much in what my hon. friend has said that requires any extended remarks from me, because it is quite evident his intention is to treat this serious motion of mine in favour of the farmers of the North-west as a farce. The hon. gentleman dwelt on my record. I do not need any defence, in the eyes of the farmers of the North-west, against any attacks by the hon. gentleman. Five hundred members for Lisgar, and his newspaper multiplied a hundred fold, would not affect my position with the farmers of the North-west

Territories, led in fifteen

Mr. SOPER

Mr. DAVIN. I saw a you the stores on clearly not think it is t will not me and might b

But take t sion, in the and even spo friend the P Why? Beca tionist, an I went bac Moose Jaw— west a syllab twine. But friends in th the thing w moment I be cessary to d twine, I pre it was in co action that not in conse of the Postm ernment did gentleman. will take th now and the that if they Government. What happer moved the homesteads, the Governn Macdonald, that ever liv friend as v against it, fighting that donald was i his place, he against it th not prevent did the man Lisgar says, Sir, I divide Government succeeded in the Territor homestead. second home put \$400 into of every hon man, who b paper of his what he thi who only c day, and wh here, putting you have re my point. I Agriculture in the west,

Territories, because that position is entrenched in fifteen years of faithful service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. What animal is that I hear? I saw a young lion in the window of one of the stores on Sparks Street, but that voice is clearly not the voice of a lion. I rather think it is the voice of an animal which I will not mention, because he has long ears and might hear me.

But take the session of 1891. In that session, in the matter of binder twine, I voted and even spoke against the motion of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). Why? Because I was, as I am now, a protectionist, and up to that moment—nay, until I went back and met my constituents at Moose Jaw—I had never heard in the Northwest a syllable against the duty on binder twine. But after I went back and my friends in that country explained to me how the thing was, what did I do? From the moment I became convinced that it was necessary to deal with the subject of binder twine, I pressed it on the Government, and it was in consequence of my pressure and action that the duty was lowered. It was not in consequence of any action on the part of the Postmaster General, because the Government did not care a snap for that hon. gentleman. If the hon. member for Lisgar will take the hint, let me impress on him now and the other members from the west, that if they will only exert pressure on this Government, we will get something done. What happened in the session of 1891? I moved the motion with regard to second homesteads, which I had been pressing on the Government ever since 1887. Sir John Macdonald, the most powerful politician that ever lived in Canada, and my personal friend as well as political leader, was against it, but that did not prevent my fighting that battle. When Sir John Macdonald was ill, and Sir John Thompson took his place, he was also against it and spoke against it that session of 1891, but that did not prevent my pressing it on. But what did the man do, who, the hon. member for Lisgar says, went back on his own motion? Sir, I divided the House and brought the Government majority down to 14; and I succeeded in obtaining for every farmer in the Territories who wanted it, a second homestead. I succeeded in enabling him to second homestead his pre-emption, and thus put \$400 into his pocket and into the pockets of every homesteader in the west. Yet this man, who blows hot and cold in that newspaper of his own at Winnipeg, according to what he thinks suits his own purpose, and who only came into the House the other day, and who wimples and wobbles around here, putting up bogus motions like the one you have read, he says I do not prove my point. Let me tell what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said when he was in the west, and then—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for the hon. gentleman to characterize my motion as a bogus motion?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is, perhaps, not out of order, but I do not think it is an expression that should be used. And I would say the same with regard to another expression that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), when referring to a member of the House he said "that man."

Mr. DAVIN. Did I say that man? I apologize to the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) for calling him "that man." It shows how one, in the heat of debate, is apt to forget himself. It would be impossible, with the deepest plummet that ever sounded the depths of the Atlantic to measure the depth of my respect for the hon. member. I am sorry I called him a man. Nothing on this earth would lead me to repeat any such misnomer with regard to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EARLE. You will not do it again?

Mr. DAVIN. No, I will not do it again. I am easily corrected; I am corrigible, and, in that respect, I differ from the hon. member, who is incorrigible. I think that is parliamentary. Now, this is what the present Minister of Agriculture said when he was in the west. Speaking at Moosomin, as you will find in the Moosomin "Spectator" of October 4th, 1894, he said:

Because the United States Congress had made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian Government to take advantage of that offer. Last year the farmers of western Canada imported \$120,000 worth of American implements, on which they paid \$40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combination, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own market showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. If Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers?

Now, that is exactly what we say. The hon. gentleman says I did not prove my point, though I quoted from the programme of 1893, I quoted the campaign sheet of 1895-96, I quoted his own leader and have just quoted the Minister of Agriculture. Sir, I might have quoted the hon. gentleman himself, because he is aware—and he has the proof in his own pocket—that there is a combine with regard to spades and shovels. He has placed before this House the evidence of that combine. And I say here that it is one of the strongest doctrines of protection that the very minute any industry resorts to a combine, that very minute, in the interests of protection, you should strike at that industry. And he himself, I think, knows that there is actually a combine in agricultural implements

as well. One great industry has swallowed up a number of the others, and therefore he is bound, not only by what has taken place in this House, but by his own professions—because I believe his constituency was placarded, "Vote for free agricultural implements"—to take radical action upon that subject.

Let me deal briefly with one argument of the hon. gentleman. Would it be parliamentary to say that my hon. friend is a little fresh? It would not be elegant. I will not say it, therefore. He quoted an argument of mine in reply to the criticisms that though an amended tariff was put forward by the Conservative Government in 1894, represented by my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Foster) as Finance Minister, that they would not adhere to it if they won the election that was supposed to follow in 1895—it was supposed that at that time that it would be held in that year. I argued that there was no such thing known up to that time as a Government winning on a policy that they had propounded in Parliament and carried before the people and going back on that policy, and he says I am inconsistent now because I say in regard to this Government that it should carry out its pledges made before it went to the country. Why, he should see that my argument means that these gentlemen are bound to carry out their pledges. What I said was that there was never such a thing known as a Government having propounded a policy in Parliament and having gone to the country upon it and won, going back on that policy. I had known instances before it was added to by this Government, I had known instances in the history of England where a party, though propounding a policy in opposition, had failed to carry it fully out, not indeed a formal policy, but had failed to carry out many pledges. But they were reprobated as I reprobate this Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a word? The comment I made was made a little too soon. I should have read this paragraph before making it:

But, he said, it was not uncommon for men in opposition to propound opinions and propose measures in regard to which, on getting into office, they became silent.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear. Is that not what I say now; and is this not what these renegades say? Is not that parliamentary? If you will read in the speeches of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think you will find it used. If not, I will fall back upon the word "gang" or "crew," which, I think, was a favourite expression of his. If my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) is through with the "Hansard" containing Mr. Cleveland's motion, I would like to see it, as I cannot see it here.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will send the hon. gentleman the "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do you think that farmers of the country have paid on agricultural implements on which we here demand relief? They have paid, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, \$93,474. That is on agricultural implements, pure and simple.

Sir CHARLES HILBERT TUPPER.
That is, if they pay the duty, as hon.
gentlemen opposite say.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, if they do. I am arguing on the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite. Here we have the item of "harvesters, self-binding and without binders." The whole duty paid under this item for the year ending 30th June last was \$40,647, of which \$25,980 was paid in the west. On hoc the amount paid was \$365, of which more than half was paid in the west. On horse-rakes, the duty was \$2,760, of which \$1,887 was paid in the west. On mowing machines the duty paid throughout Canada was \$18,000, of which \$8,700 was paid in the west. And so on. This shows that we in the west are deeply interested in this matter.

Now, in regard to the hon. gentleman's amendment, if he will tell me that there is any chance of its doing any good, I will help him. I will take it as an instalment. I do not refuse to vote for people on the opposite side, if I can help forward the end I am aiming at. The new members in this House must know that I have treated the Government side in a different way from what they have treated me. I have not shrunk from supporting them, if I could do anything for the farmers. Now, I will not cavil at the hon. gentleman's motion. If that will carry, if that motion that we will have 10 per cent—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Be reduced to 10 per cent, instead of 20 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I will vote for that motion, and next year, if the farmers are not content with that, and I do not think they should be with the promises they have from the Government, we can press further. But, with the hope of making some progress, I will vote for my hon. friend's motion, reducing it to 10 per cent, and I hope his own Government will now support him.

Mr. DAVIN. It looks to me as if the amendment of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was made with a view of allowing a motion like this of the Finance Minister to come from the Treasury benches and so let them down easily. Before I speak on the question of adjournment, I call your attention to the fact that the motion is out of order and I ask your decision on it. I may say that if we are allowed a vote, and

end the lion.

ker, what do
country have
s on which
y have paid,
vigation Re-
cultural im-

TUPPER.
ty, as hon.

do. I am
gentlemen
em of "har-
ut binders."
item for the
s \$40,647, of
west. On
55, of which
e west. On
90, of which
On mowing
ughout Can-
00 was paid
This shows
interested in

gentleman's
that there is
good, I will
instalment.
people on the
yard the end
ubers in this
treated the
t way from
I have not
if I could do
y, I will not
motion. If
that we will

ed to 10 per

ote for that
farmers are
do not think
es they have
ress further.
me progress,
s motion, re-
ope his own
im.

as if the
from Lisgar
th a view of
the Finance
sury benches
fore I speak
I call your
otion is out
on on it. I
a vote, and

If my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) will assure me there is a chance that the Government will accept his proposition, I will vote for his amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) be kind enough to state his point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. The point is that a private member moves that a certain definite change be made in the tariff. It does not add to the burdens of the people, I admit, and in that way it may be held to be in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this motion of the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) is out of order, then the motion of the hon. member (Mr. Davin) would be out of order for the same reason.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There seems to be a distinction, Mr. Speaker, between the two motions if my reading of the text of Dr. Bourinot's book be correct. There is a distinction between a motion for the removal of duty altogether, and a motion to establish a certain fixed duty. At page 557 of Dr. Bourinot's book I find this in connection with the imposition of taxes:

But it is not regular to propose a new and distinct tax, which is not a mere increase—

That of course does not apply.

—or diminution of a duty upon an article already recommended by Government for taxation. But any proposition for the repeal of a duty is always in order.

I understand the main motion is a recommendation for the repeal of a duty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No, it is simply a censure on the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that either motion is out of order.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson), amongst a number of statements he made about myself, quoted what he said last year and to which I did not think it worth while then to reply. He (Mr. Richardson) said:

When Mr. Cleveland's motion was put to place coal oil on the free list, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) voted against it.

Now, Sir, there was no division whatever on Mr. Cleveland's motion. Mr. Cleveland, on Thursday, February 9th, 1893, moved:

That is it expedient to place coal oil on the free list.

And at six o'clock the debate terminated and there never was any division on it. I look in "Hansard" amongst the list of divisions, and there is no division whatever on the motion. Here is the "Hansard" of 1893 to prove it. This is just a sample, Mr. Speaker, of the reckless statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) here. There is not a shadow of foundation for the statement that I voted against Mr. Cleveland's motion. If the motion of the Minister of Finance is carried now, it will throw the matter over and we will never reach it again this session. I think it very desirable that we should have the opinion of this House as to how it regards the conduct of the Government in being false to its pledges on this matter of agricultural implements. Question, Mr. Speaker.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Fielding) to adjourn the debate:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain,	Hurley,
Beith,	Joly de Lotbinière
Blair,	(Sir Henri),
Bostock,	Lang,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bourbonnais,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Logan,
Burnett,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Calvert,	McGregor,
Casey,	McMillan,
Champagne,	Malouin,
Charlton,	Maxwell,
Christie,	Mignault,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mulock,
Edwards,	Oliver,
Erb,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Rogers,
Fitzpatrick,	Sampe,
Flint,	Somerville,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Sutherland,
Gauthier,	Talbot and
Godbout,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Haley,	Hibbert).—46.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Davin,	Quinn,
Douglas,	Richardson,
Earle,	Roche,
Guillet,	Sproule,
LaRivière,	Taylor,
McNeill,	Wallace, and
Pope,	Wilson.—14.

Amendment to amendment agreed to, and debate adjourned.